

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-78 are pending. Claim 73 has been amended to correct a minor punctuation error. No claims have been canceled or withdrawn.

In view of the following arguments, withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102(e)

Claims 1-78 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by US patent number 6,289,382 to Bowman-Amuah. This rejection is traversed.

A fundamental aspect of 35 USC §102(e) is that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is described in a single prior art reference. (MPEP §2131.01). Bowman-Amuah does not describe each and every feature of claims 1-78 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites “detecting a state change to an object in a directory”, and “responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to a workflow comprising a set of tasks”, and “executing the tasks to achieve a desired state in the directory.” In addressing these claimed features, the March 11, 2005 Office Action (“Action”) asserts that they are respectively described by Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-46, 2-11, and 24-37. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Let's take a close look at these cited portions of Bowman-Amuah (in the order disclosed by Bowman-Amuah). Column 117, lines 1-12, recites:

“Rule Management

1 *A business process workflow is typically composed of many different*
2 *roles and routes. Decisions must be made as to what to route to*
3 *which role, and when. Rule Management Services support the*
4 *routing of workflow activities by providing the intelligence*
5 *necessary to determine which routes are appropriate given the state*
6 *of a given process and knowledge of the organization's workflow*
7 *processing rules. Rule Management Services are typically*
8 *implemented through easily maintainable tables or rule bases which*
9 *define the possible flows for a business event."*

10 Bowman, at column 117, lines 24-37 recites:

11 *"Typical workflow application requirements are better general*
12 *management control and better management of change. Proactive*
13 *system action, audit trails and system administration features like*
14 *work queue reporting are important administration tools. Some of*
15 *the areas for monitoring for improvement are employee productivity,*
16 *process performance, and forecasting/scheduling. Where any form*
17 *of customer service is involved, features like status reports on*
18 *individual cases can sharpen customer response times while*
19 *performance monitoring of groups and individuals can help quality*
20 *improvement and efficiency exercises. Note that reports and*
21 *reporting does not necessarily mean paper reports that are*
22 *distributed in a traditional manner, it can mean electronic messages*
23 *or even triggers based on specific events."*

24 And, column 117, lines 40-47 recites:

25 *"Workflow management is frequently required in cooperative*
26 *applications because the users are generally professionals, the flow*
27 *of work in the organization is frequently highly variable, the*
28 *application units of work (legal case, sales order) are processed for*
29 *long periods of elapsed time, and work often moves from one*
30 *processing site to another. As data and application logic are split,*
31 *better control is needed to track processing/data status across*
32 *location."*

33 The above cited portions of Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 2-11, 24-
34 37, and 40-46, clearly disclose: "[a] business process workflow" with "the
35 intelligence necessary" to route workflow by providing based on tables or rule

1 basis for possible business event flows (lines 2-11), and workflow administration
2 tools, customer service, status reports, electronic messages, employee productivity
3 and customer response times(once 24-37). Lines 40-46 clearly disclose that
4 workflow management is often required in certain types of environments.
5 Additionally, these cited portions clearly disclose that when data and application
6 logic are split, control to track status across locations is required.

7 Clearly, however, the above cited portions of Bowman-Amuah at column
8 117, lines 2-11, .4-37, and 40-46 are completely silent with respect to “detecting a
9 state change to an object in a directory”, and “responsive to detecting the state
10 change: mapping the state change to the object to a workflow comprising a set of
11 tasks”, and “executing the tasks to achieve a desired state in the directory”, as
12 claim 1 recites. These cited portions to not even address “detecting a state
13 change” of any type. Since these cited portions do not address state change
14 detection, the cited portions cannot explicitly or inherently describe anything
15 performed “responsive to detecting the state change”, as claim 1 recites. For these
16 reasons alone, the above cited portions do not anticipate the recited features of
17 claim 1. Moreover, Bowman-Amuah as a whole is completely silent with respect
18 to these claimed features.

19 Accordingly, and for the above discussed reasons alone, the 35 USC 102(e)
20 rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn.

21 If claim 1 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah, it
22 is respectfully requested for the Office to particularly point out where the recited
23 features of claim 1 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-Amuah.

24 **Claims 2-18** depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated by Bowman-
25 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and for this reason

1 alone, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 2-18 is improper and should be
2 withdrawn.

3 Moreover, claims 2-18 include additional features that are not anticipated
4 by Bowman-Amuah.

5 For example, claim 3 recites “wherein executing the tasks further comprises
6 continuously executing an operation of a task of the tasks until convergence of the
7 desired state is identified.” In addressing this recited feature, the Action asserts
8 that it is anticipated by Bowman-Amuah at column 116, lines 47-63. Applicant
9 respectfully disagrees.

10 Let’s take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 116, lines 47-63, which
11 recites:

12 *“Workflow routing services route “work” to the appropriate
13 workflow queues. When an application completes processing a task,
14 it uses these services to route the work-in-progress to the next
15 required task or tasks and, in some cases, notify interested parties of
the resulting work queue changes.*

16 *The automatic movement of information and control from one
17 workflow step to another requires work profiles that describe the
18 task relationships for completing various business processes. The
19 concept of Integrated Performance Support can be exhibited by
20 providing user access to these work profiles. Such access can be
21 solely informational--to allow the user to understand the
22 relationship between tasks, or identify which tasks need to be
23 completed for a particular workflow--or navigational-- to allow the
24 user to move between tasks.”*

25 Although Bowman-Amuah in this cited portion clearly discloses using work
26 profiles to route work to a workflow queue, and a concept of “Integrated
27 Performance Support”, this cited portion is completely silent with respect to
28 “continuously executing an operation of a task of the tasks until convergence of
29

1 the desired state is identified”, as claim 3 recites. Nowhere does this cited portion,
2 or Bowman-Amuah as a whole, explicitly or inherently describe these features of
3 claim 3.

4 Accordingly, and for this additional reason, the 35USC 102(e) rejection of
5 claim 3 as anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

6 In another example, claim 7 recites “wherein mapping the state change to
7 the object further comprises evaluating the state change to the object based on a
8 declarative condition stored as a text string on an object instance of a content class
9 defined by the directory schema.” In addressing these claimed features, the action
10 asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-47.
11 Applicant disagrees.

12 Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-47 was already quoted above.
13 Referring to those quotes, Bowman-Amuah clearly discloses that workflow
14 management is often required in certain types of environments, and that when data
15 and application logic are split, control to track status across locations is required.
16 Nowhere does this cited portion, or Bowman-Amuah as a whole, explicitly or
17 inherently describe each and every one of these features recited in claim 7.
18 Nowhere does this cited portion of Bowman-Amuah describe “evaluating the state
19 change”, “a declarative condition”, “a text string on an object instance of a content
20 class defined by the directory schema”, as claim 7 recites.

21 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
22 of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

23 Moreover, if claim 7 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of
24 Bowman-Amuah, it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point
25

1 out where these claimed features are explicitly or inherently described by
2 Bowman-Amuah.

3 In yet another example, claim 10 recites “wherein mapping the state change
4 to the object, semantics of the mapping are based on an event association object
5 schema.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are
6 described by Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 4-10. Applicant disagrees.
7 The cited portion was already quoted above. Referring to those quotes, Bowman-
8 Amuah clearly discloses “[a] business process workflow” with “the intelligence
9 necessary” to route workflow by providing based on tables or rule basis for
10 possible business event flows. Nowhere does this explicit description explicitly or
11 inherently describe “an event association object schema” as claim 10 recites.

12 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
13 of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

14 Moreover, if claim 10 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of
15 Bowman-Amuah, it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point
16 out where these claimed features are explicitly or inherently described by
17 Bowman-Amuah.

18 In another example, claim 11 recites “wherein executing the tasks at least
19 one subset of the tasks are executed with respect to one another based on an order
20 of execution relationship comprising a finish-start relationship, a parallel
21 execution relationship, a precedence constraint relationship, or a task priority
22 relationship.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are
23 described by Bowman-Amuah at column 118, lines 26-42. Applicant disagrees.

24 Let’s take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 118, lines 26-42, which
25 recites:

1 *"How an organization approaches the management of its workflow
2 will determine which workflow management tools are appropriate to
3 the organization. In general, there are three types of workflow,
4 production, collaborative, and ad hoc. A production environment
5 involves high transaction rates and thousands of documents in which
6 the rules for a certain document can be defined for most of the time.
7 Examples include accounts payable, insurance claims processing,
8 and loan processing. A collaborative environment involves multiple
9 departments viewing a single document with typically less number of
documents than in the production environment. One example is a
sales order. Ad hoc workflows arise from the specific temporary
needs of a project team whose members become active and inactive
depending on their function within the group. What is the
relationship between the workflow and imaging components?"*

10 Although the above cited portion from Bowman-Amuah clearly discloses a
11 discussion about ad hoc workflows, this cited portion is completely silent with
12 respect to any "order of execution relationship", as claim 11 recites. And certainly
13 this cited portion does not explicitly or inherently describe any "execution
14 relationship comprising a finish-start relationship, a parallel execution
15 relationship, a precedence constraint relationship, or a task priority relationship",
16 as Applicant claims. Moreover, Bowman-Amuah as a whole does not explicitly or
17 inherently describe these claimed features.

18 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
19 of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

20 If claim 11 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
21 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
22 features recited in claim 11 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
23 Amuah.

24 In another example, claim 12 recites "wherein executing the tasks at least
25 one subset of the tasks is executed with respect to one another based on a

1 precedence constraint relationship or a task priority relationship.” In addressing
2 these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are described by Bowman-
3 Amuah at column 118, lines 2-10. Applicant disagrees.

4 Let’s take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 118, lines 2-10, which
5 recites:

6 *“Workflow management can be extended to automate work
7 scheduling. A system may be able to do as good a job, or better, in
8 scheduling a user’s work. This might be due to a very large amount
9 of work to be assigned to a large pool, a complex method of
10 assigning priorities, an extremely dynamic environment, or some
other reason. Another advantage to work scheduling is that the
system can initiate some needed activity automatically for the user in
anticipation of the next task”*

11 Although the above cited portion from Bowman-Amuah clearly discloses a
12 general discussion extending workflow management to automate work scheduling,
13 this cited portion is completely silent with respect to any “subset of the tasks is
14 executed with respect to one another based on a precedence constraint relationship
15 or a task priority relationship”, as claim 12 recites. Moreover, Bowman-Amuah as
16 a whole does not explicitly or inherently describe these claimed features.

17 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
18 of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

19 If claim 12 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
20 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
21 features recited in claim 12 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
22 Amuah.

23 In another example, claim 13 recites “monitoring a status corresponding to
24 a task of the tasks”, “storing the status on a status monitoring object”, and

1 "wherein a content class in the directory schema defines the status-monitoring
2 object." In addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are
3 described by Bowman-Amuah at column 115 lines 48-54. Applicant disagrees.

4 Let's take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 115 lines 26-54, which
5 recite:

6 *"Workflow enables tasks within a business process to be passed
7 among the appropriate participants, in the correct sequence, and
8 facilitates their completion within set times and budgets. Task
9 definition includes the actions required as well as work folders
10 containing forms, documents, images and transactions. It uses
11 business process rules, routing information, role definitions and
queues. Workflow functionality is crucial for the customer service
and engineering applications to automate the business value chains,
and monitor and control the sequence of work electronically."*

12 *The business processes can be of a repetitive nature, eg
13 automatically routing and controlling the review of a work plan
14 through the approval stages. These are called production workflows.
15 Conversely it can be an ad hoc process, eg generating and
16 delivering a work order for a special meter reading to a meter
17 reader who is available to perform the task. In production workflows
18 the processes are predefined, whereas ad hoc workflows are created
only for a specific nonrecurrent situation. Often it is difficult to
determine how much ad hoc functionality that needs to be provided.
An overly strict production workflow may not support necessary
special cases that must be handled in an ad hoc fashion.*

19 *Workflow provides a mechanism to define, monitor and control the
20 sequence of work electronically. These services are typically
21 provided by the server as they often coordinate activities between
multiple users on multiple computers.*

22 *The following are some of the architectural and integration issues
23 that must be addressed:"*

24 Plainly, the above cited portion from Bowman-Amuah is a general discussion
25 about benefits of enabling workflow in a business. Nowhere does this cited

1 portion, or Bowman-Amuah as a whole, explicitly or inherently describe
2 “monitoring a status corresponding to a task of the tasks”, “storing the status on a
3 status monitoring object”, and “wherein a content class in the directory schema
4 defines the status-monitoring object”, as claim 13 recites.

5 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
6 of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

7 If claim 13 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
8 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
9 features recited in claim 13 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
10 Amuah.

11 In another example, claim 14 recites “monitoring a set of directory
12 resources affected by the workflow”, “storing the directory resources on a status
13 monitoring object”, and “wherein a content class in the directory schema defines
14 the status-monitoring object.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action
15 asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 101, lines 26-38.

16 Applicant disagrees.

17 Let’s take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 101, lines 26-38, which
18 recites:

19 *“The popularity of the Internets HTTP protocol has revived the
20 potential need for implementing some form of Context Management
21 Services (storing state information on the server). The HTTP
22 protocol is a stateless protocol. Every connection is negotiated from
23 scratch, not just at the page level but for every element on the page.
24 The server does not maintain a session connection with the client
25 nor save any information between client exchanges (i.e., web page
submits or requests). Each HTTP exchange is a completely
independent event. Therefore, information entered into one HTML
form must be saved by the associated server application somewhere*

1 *where it can be accessed by subsequent programs in a
2 conversation.”*

3 The above cited portion from Bowman-Amuah merely provides a general
4 discussion about a “potential need for implementing some form of Context
5 Management Services”. Nowhere does this cited portion, or Bowman-Amuah as a
6 whole, explicitly or inherently describe “monitoring a set of directory resources
7 affected by the workflow”, “storing the directory resources on a status monitoring
8 object”, and “wherein a content class in the directory schema defines the status-
9 monitoring object”, as claim 14 recites.

10 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
11 of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

12 If claim 14 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
13 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
14 features recited in claim 14 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
15 Amuah.

16 In yet another example, claim 15 recites “monitoring a status corresponding
17 to an operation of the workflow”, “determining that the status comprises a failure
18 status”, “responsive to the determining, taking a corrective action to advance the
19 workflow in view of the failure status”, and “wherein a content class in the
20 directory schema defines the status-monitoring object.” In addressing these
21 claimed features, the Action asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at
22 column 117, lines 24-38. Applicant disagrees. This cited portion of Bowman-
23 Amuah has already been quoted above. Upon close inspection of the explicit
24 description of Bowman-Amuah, it is clear that not one of the claimed features is
25 explicitly or inherently described in that cited section.

1 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
2 of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

3 If claim 15 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
4 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
5 features recited in claim 15 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
6 Amuah.

7 In another example, claim 17 recites “wherein the tasks represent an inverse
8 set of tasks that were previously performed as part of a different workflow.” In
9 addressing these claimed features, the Action asserts that they are described by
10 Bowman-Amuah at column 116, lines 38-47. Applicant disagrees.

11 Let’s take a look at Bowman-Amuah at column 116, lines 38-52, which
12 recites:

13 *“Route management*

14 *Route management enables the routing of tasks to the next role,
15 which can be done in the following ways:*

16 *Serial--the tasks are sequentially performed;*

17 *Parallel--the work is divided among different players;*

18 *Conditional--routing is based upon certain conditions; and*

19 *Ad hoc--work which is not part of a predefined process.*

20 *Workflow routing services route “work” to the appropriate
21 workflow queues. When an application completes processing a task,
22 it uses these services to route the work-in-progress to the next
23 required task or tasks and, in some cases, notify interested parties of
24 the resulting work queue changes.”*

25 Clearly, nowhere does this cited portion explicitly or inherently describe “wherein
26 the tasks represent an inverse set of tasks that were previously performed as part of
27 a different workflow”, as claim 17 recites.

1 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
2 of claim 17 should be withdrawn.

3 If claim 17 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
4 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
5 features recited in claim 17 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
6 Amuah.

7 In yet another example, claim 18 recites “wherein the tasks implement a
8 policy with respect to one or more directory resources, and wherein mapping the
9 state change to the object further comprises automatically determining the
10 workflow based on the policy.” In addressing these claimed features, the Action
11 asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 1-12.
12 Applicant disagrees. This cited portion of Bowman-Amuah has already been
13 quoted above with respect to the arguments of why Bowman-Amuah does not
14 anticipate claim 1. Upon close inspection of the explicit description of Bowman-
15 Amuah, it is clear that the features of claim 18 are explicitly or inherently
16 described in that cited section. For purposes of convenience and emphasis,
17 Applicant again recites the cited portion below.

18 Column 117, lines 1-12, recites:

19 *“Rule Management*

20 *A business process workflow is typically composed of many different
21 roles and routes. Decisions must be made as to what to route to
22 which role, and when. Rule Management Services support the
23 routing of workflow activities by providing the intelligence
24 necessary to determine which routes are appropriate given the state
of a given process and knowledge of the organization's workflow
processing rules. Rule Management Services are typically
implemented through easily maintainable tables or rule bases which
define the possible flows for a business event.”*

1
2 Clearly, nowhere does this general discussion of Bowman-Amuah about the
3 “different roles and routes” of a “business profile workflow” explicitly or
4 inherently describe recites “wherein the tasks implement a policy with respect to
5 one or more directory resources, and wherein mapping the state change to the
6 object further comprises automatically determining the workflow based on the
7 policy”, as claim 18 recites.

8 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection
9 of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

10 If claim 18 is again rejected on a similar basis in view of Bowman-Amuah,
11 it is respectfully requested for the Office to specifically point out where these
12 features recited in claim 18 are explicitly or inherently described by Bowman-
13 Amuah.

14 **Claim 19** recites “detecting a state change to an object in a directory”, and
15 “responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to
16 a workflow comprising a set of tasks”, and “executing the tasks to achieve a
17 desired state in the directory.” For the reasons already discussed above with
18 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these claimed features.

19 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by
20 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

21 **Claims 20-36** depend from claim 19 and are allowable over Bowman-
22 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

23 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 20-36 as anticipated by
24 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

1 Moreover, claims 20-36 include additional features that are not anticipated
2 by Bowman-Amuah. For example:

- 3 • the features of claim 21 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
4 already described above with respect to claim 3;
- 5 • the features of claim 25 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
6 already described above with respect to claim 7;
- 7 • the features of claim 28 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
8 already described above with respect to claim 10;
- 9 • the features of claim 29 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
10 already described above with respect to claim 11;
- 11 • the features of claim 30 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
12 already described above with respect to claim 12;
- 13 • the features of claim 31 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
14 already described above with respect to claim 13;
- 15 • the features of claim 32 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
16 already described above with respect to claim 14;
- 17 • the features of claim 33 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
18 already described above with respect to claim 15;
- 19 • the features of claim 35 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
20 already described above with respect to claim 17; and
- 21 • the features of claim 36 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
22 already described above with respect to claim 18.

23 **Claim 37** recites “detecting a state change to an object in a directory”, and
24 “responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to
25

1 a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to achieve a
2 desired state in the directory." For the reasons already discussed above with
3 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these claimed features.

4 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 37 as anticipated by
5 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

6 **Claims 38-54** depend from claim 37 and are allowable over Bowman-
7 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

8 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 38-54 as anticipated by
9 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

10 Moreover, claims 38-54 include additional features that are not anticipated
11 by Bowman-Amuah. For example:

- 12 • the features of claim 39 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
13 already described above with respect to claim 3;
- 14 • the features of claim 43 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
15 already described above with respect to claim 7;
- 16 • the features of claim 46 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
17 already described above with respect to claim 10;
- 18 • the features of claim 47 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
19 already described above with respect to claim 11;
- 20 • the features of claim 48 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
21 already described above with respect to claim 12;
- 22 • the features of claim 49 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
23 already described above with respect to claim 13;
- 24 • the features of claim 50 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
25 already described above with respect to claim 14;

- 1 the features of claim 51 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
2 already described above with respect to claim 15;
- 3 the features of claim 53 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
4 already described above with respect to claim 17; and
- 5 the features of claim 54 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
6 already described above with respect to claim 18.

7 **Claim 55** recites "detecting a state change to an object in a directory", and
8 "responsive to detecting the state change: mapping the state change to the object to
9 a workflow comprising a set of tasks", and "executing the tasks to achieve a
10 desired state in the directory." For the reasons already discussed above with
11 respect to claim 1, Bowman-Amuah does not anticipate these recited features of
12 claim 55.

13 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 55 as anticipated by
14 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

15 **Claims 56-72** depend from claim 55 and are allowable over Bowman-
16 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

17 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 56-72 as anticipated by
18 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

19 Moreover, claims 56-72 include additional features that are not anticipated
20 by Bowman-Amuah. For example:

- 21 the features of claim 57 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
22 already described above with respect to claim 3;
- 23 the features of claim 61 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
24 already described above with respect to claim 7;

- 1 • the features of claim 64 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
2 already described above with respect to claim 10;
- 3 • the features of claim 65 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
4 already described above with respect to claim 11;
- 5 • the features of claim 66 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
6 already described above with respect to claim 12;
- 7 • the features of claim 67 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
8 already described above with respect to claim 13;
- 9 • the features of claim 68 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
10 already described above with respect to claim 14;
- 11 • the features of claim 69 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
12 already described above with respect to claim 15;
- 13 • the features of claim 71 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
14 already described above with respect to claim 17; and
- 15 • the features of claim 72 are not anticipated by Bowman-Amuah for the reasons
16 already described above with respect to claim 18.

17 **Claim 73** is directed to "[a] workflow enabled directory schema comprising
18 a plurality of base object content classes" that include "a provisioning service
19 content class to detect an event corresponding to a state change in a directory
20 object", "a workflow content class for storing a sequence of tasks", "an event
21 association content class for storing declarative conditions to map the state change
22 to the directory object to an object instance of the workflow content class", and
23 "wherein the provisioning service content class is further configured to execute the
24
25

1 sequence of tasks corresponding to the object instance." Nowhere does Bowman-
2 Amuah explicitly or inherently describe these recited features of claim 73.

3 In addressing claim 73, the Action at page 6, section 20, asserts that the
4 claimed features are taught by Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-46 and 1-
5 13, and column 116, lines 38-44. Applicant disagrees.

6 Let's take a look at these portions of Bowman-Amuah cited by the Action
7 as anticipating "a provisioning service content class to detect an event
8 corresponding to a state change in a directory object", as claim 73 recites.
9 Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-47 recites:

10 *"Workflow management is frequently required in cooperative
11 applications because the users are generally professionals, the flow
12 of work in the organization is frequently highly variable, the
13 application units of work (legal case, sales order) are processed for
14 long periods of elapsed time, and work often moves from one
processing site to another. As data and application logic are split,
better control is needed to track processing/data status across
location."*

15 Nowhere does this recited portion of Bowman-Amuah explicitly or inherently
16 described the features of "a provisioning service content class to detect an event
17 corresponding to a state change in a directory object", as claim 73 recites.

18 For this reason alone, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 73 as
19 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

20 Next, the Action asserts that "a workflow content class for storing a
21 sequence of tasks", and "an event association content class for storing declarative
22 conditions to map the state change to the directory object to an object instance of
23 the workflow content class", as claim 73 recites, is described by Bowman-Amuah
24 at column 117, lines 40-46. This assertion is unsupportable.

25 Bowman-Amuah at column 117, lines 40-47 recites:

1 *"Workflow management is frequently required in cooperative*
2 *applications because the users are generally professionals, the flow*
3 *of work in the organization is frequently highly variable, the*
4 *application units of work (legal case, sales order) are processed for*
5 *long periods of elapsed time, and work often moves from one*
6 *processing site to another. As data and application logic are split,*
7 *better control is needed to track processing/data status across*
8 *location."*

9 Nowhere does this recited portion of Bowman-Amuah, or any other previously
10 cited portion of Bowman-Amuah, or Bowman-Amuah as a whole, explicitly or
11 inherently describe "a workflow content class for storing a sequence of tasks",
12 and "an event association content class for storing declarative conditions to map
13 the state change to the directory object to an object instance of the workflow
14 content class", as claim 73 recites.

15 For this additional reason, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 73 as
16 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah should be withdrawn.

17 Finally, the Action asserts that "wherein the provisioning service content
18 class is further configured to execute the sequence of tasks corresponding to the
19 object instance", as claim 73 recites, is described by Bowman-Amuah at column
20 116, lines 38-44. This assertion is also unsupportable.

21 Bowman-Amuah at column 116, lines 38-52, clearly discloses the
22 following:

23 *"Route management*

24 *Route management enables the routing of tasks to the next role,*
25 *which can be done in the following ways:*
26 *Serial--the tasks are sequentially performed;*
27 *Parallel--the work is divided among different players;*
28 *Conditional--routing is based upon certain conditions; and*
29 *Ad hoc--work which is not part of a predefined process.*

1 *Workflow routing services route "work" to the appropriate*
2 *workflow queues. When an application completes processing a task,*
3 *it uses these services to route the work-in-progress to the next*
4 *required task or tasks and, in some cases, notify interested parties of*
5 *the resulting work queue changes."*

6 Nowhere does this recited portion of Bowman-Amuah, or any other previously
7 cited portion of Bowman-Amuah, or Bowman-Amuah as a whole, explicitly or
8 inherently describe "wherein the provisioning service content class is further
9 configured to execute the sequence of tasks corresponding to the object instance",
10 as claim 73 recites.

11 For this additional reason, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 73 as
12 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

13 **Claims 74-78** depend from claim 73 and are not anticipated by Bowman-
14 Amuah solely by virtue of this dependency.

15 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 74-78 as anticipated by
16 Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

17 Moreover, claims 74-78 include additional features that are not explicitly or
18 inherently described by Bowman-Amuah.

19 For example, claim 74 recites "wherein at least a subset of the base object
20 content classes comprise a respective flexible attribute data field that indicates a
21 data type, the data type being used to express various operational or data providing
22 properties of the flexible attribute, the various operational or data providing
23 properties being independent of the data type and independent of any modification
24 to the workflow enabled directory schema." In addressing these claimed features,
25 the Action asserts that they are described by Bowman-Amuah at column 115, lines
55-65. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

1 Bowman-Amuah at column 115, lines 55-67 clearly discloses:

2 "Process integration

3 *The workflow system must achieve a seamless integration of*
4 *multiple processes. The workflow system must control the business*
5 *process, eg it should be able to open a word processor with the*
6 *relevant data coming from a previous business process;*

7 *Infrastructure integration from PC to mainframe*

8 *The ability to interface with the host-based hardware, system*
9 *software, and database management systems is critical. This is*
10 *essential because the workflow system is located between the client-*
11 *based and host-based processes, ie it can initiate client-based as*
12 *well as host-based applications; some cases, notify interested parties*
13 *of the resulting work queue changes."*

14 Clearly, the above cited portion of Bowman-Amuah is completely silent with
15 respect to any "base object content classes comprise a respective flexible attribute
16 data field", as claim 74 recites.

17 For this additional reason, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 74 as
18 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

19 In another example, claim 76 recites "a status monitoring content class for
20 storing a status of an object instance of the workflow content class." The Action
21 asserts that these claimed features are described by Bowman-Amuah at column
22 115, lines 27-36. This assertion is unsupportable.

23 Column 115, lines 27-36 recite:

24 *"Workflow enables tasks within a business process to be passed*
25 *among the appropriate participants, in the correct sequence, and*
facilitates their completion within set times and budgets. Task
definition includes the actions required as well as work folders
containing forms, documents, images and transactions. It uses
business process rules, routing information, role definitions and

1 *queues. Workflow functionality is crucial for the customer service*
2 *and engineering applications to automate the business value chains,*
3 *and monitor and control the sequence of work electronically.*

4 Nowhere does this cited portion of Bowman-Amuah explicitly or inherently
5 describe "a status monitoring content class" of any type.

6 For this additional reason, the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claim 76 as
7 anticipated by Bowman-Amuah is improper and should be withdrawn.

8 If claim 76 is again rejected as anticipated by Bowman-Amuah, Applicant
9 respectfully requests the Office to particularly point out exactly where Bowman-
10 Amuah explicitly or inherently describes such a "status monitoring content class",
11 as claim 76 recites.

12 **Conclusion**

13 Pending claims 1-78 are in condition for allowance and action to that end is
14 respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the
15 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance
16 of a subsequent Office action.

17 Respectfully Submitted,

18 Dated: 6/13/2005

19 By:

20 
21 _____
22 Brian G. Hart
23 Reg. No. 44, 421
24 (509) 324-9256